

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASIMIRO JOSE CANHA CAVACO
DIAS,

Petitioner,

v.

RULA NABIL KHOURY CAVACO DIAS,

Respondent.

Case No. 24-cv-04471-EMC

**ORDER RE RESPONDENT'S LETTER
OF APRIL 17, 2025**

Docket No. 194

Respondent has filed a letter, asking that the Court hold Petitioner in contempt for violating its order at Docket No. 185 (implicitly, including its minute order at Docket No. 165) and its order at Docket No. 193. Respondent contends that Petitioner has violated the orders because he is contesting the jurisdiction of the California state court for the domestic violence proceedings.

The Court anticipates that Petitioner will argue that he should not be held in contempt because: he did not violate any order, he substantially complied with the orders, and/or any failure to comply was based on a good faith interpretation of the orders. *See* Docket No. 193 (Order at 1) (taking note of the same arguments made by Petitioner in conjunction with a different letter filed by Plaintiff). Instead of engaging in a second debate over what exactly the Court's prior orders required, the Court finds it preferable to move matters forward substantively. The Court shall not, at this juncture, hold Petitioner in contempt of a prior order, nor shall it order any of the relief, financial or otherwise, requested by Respondent. However, so that the record is clear, moving forward, Petitioner shall submit to the jurisdiction of all proceedings related in any way to and shall adjudicate substantively all custody, visitation, domestic violence, and/or any other related


proceedings in California state court. The Court's dismissal of the instant action (at Petitioner's request) was based on the understanding that Petitioner agreed to substantively litigate all such proceedings in California state court. He therefore agreed to forego raising procedural challenges in state court, such as a lack of jurisdiction. Petitioner is forewarned that failure to comply with this order could give rise to contempt proceedings.

Respondent suggests that counsel for Petitioner, Mr. Min, may withdraw as counsel in the near future. **If so, complete contact information for Petitioner, including a telephone number and an email address shall promptly be provided to the Court.** Withdrawal of representation in matters before this Court requires approval by this Court.

This order disposes of Docket No. 194.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 18, 2025


EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge